

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Holly Fujie

Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles on 08/26/2019 12:57 PM Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, by M. Barel, Deputy Clerk

1 MICHAEL N. FEUER (SBN 111529), City Attorney
 2 ARTURO A. MARTINEZ (SBN 180355)

3 Deputy Chief, Safe Neighborhoods & Gang Div.

4 JONATHAN CRISTALL (SBN 191935)

5 Supervising Assistant City Attorney

6 LIORA FORMAN-ECHOLS (SBN 184135)

7 Asst. Superv. Deputy City Attorney

8 NANCY C. HAGAN (SBN 273981)

9 Deputy City Attorney

10 OFFICE OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY

11 200 N. Main St., Rm. 966, Los Angeles, California 90012

12 Tel. (213) 978-4090; Fax (213) 978-8717; nancy.hagan@lacity.org

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff

NO FEE – GOV'T CODE § 6103

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 KENNETH J. D'OYEN and MARJORIE E. D'OYEN,
 15 as trustees of the D'OYEN FAMILY TRUST
 16 DATED OCTOBER 9, 2002; and DOES 1 through
 17 50, inclusive,

18 Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR ABATEMENT
AND INJUNCTION**

[CIVIL CODE SECTION 3479, *ET*
 SEQ.; BUS. & PROF. CODE
 SECTION 17200, *ET* SEQ.]

[Unlimited Action]

1 PLAINTIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, alleges as follows:

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 1. This action ("Action") is brought and prosecuted by Plaintiff, the People of the
4 State of California ("People"), for the purpose of abating, preventing, and enjoining a gang-
5 related public nuisance that exists at a three-level, approximately 27-unit apartment complex
6 located in the Hyde Park neighborhood of South Los Angeles with an address commonly
7 known as 6811 10th Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90043 (the "Property"). The Property,
8 which is located within 1,000 feet of three schools¹, has been the site of shootings and
9 numerous arrests, including several for unlawful firearm possession. The Action is brought
10 pursuant to the Public Nuisance Law ("PNL"), California Civil Code sections 3479-3480, and
11 the Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), California Business and Professions Code section 17200,
12 *et seq.*

13 2. For at least the past eight years, the Property has been under the control of the
14 Rollin' 60s ("R60s"), a criminal street gang. The Property has such significance to the gang
15 that the gang members have nicknamed it the "New Jacks," a reference to "New Jack City," an
16 iconic 90's movie, which centers on an apartment complex that a gang controls and utilizes for
17 its narcotics sales. The Property is also prominently featured in R60s' rap videos.

18 3. In order to demonstrate their control over the Property and the surrounding
19 neighborhood, which R60s claims as its territory, the gang members and associates
20 congregate at the Property in large groups, sometimes as many as 50 to 60 at a time, on the
21 Property's front lawn, the courtyard, the rear carport, and in the common laundry room; their
22 presence also spills out from the Property onto the sidewalk and into the street. They are often
23 dressed in gang attire or with their shirts off, conspicuously displaying gang tattoos, usually
24 while smoking marijuana, drinking alcohol, playing dice, and/or listening to loud music. The
25 gang members' physical presence at the Property, while so blatantly representing the gang
26 with their attire and tattoos, is meant to project power to rival gangs and intimidate law-abiding
27

28

1 The schools within 1,000 feet of the Property include YES Academy/Hyde Park Elementary, Alliance Virgil Roberts Leadership Academy, and Alliance Renee & Meyer Luskin Academy.

1 community members who might consider cooperating with law enforcement against the gang.
2 The Property also acts as a refuge when they are hanging out in front of it, as gang members
3 and associates often run back into the Property upon encountering rival gang members or law
4 enforcement. Not every building within a gang's turf is available for exploitation by a gang the
5 way the Property is; other buildings are, for example, managed better, more physically fortified,
6 or lack gang "friendlies" who attract gang members in the first place.

7 4. Indeed since 2011, there have been at least two documented shootings at the
8 Property, and the Los Angeles Police Department ("LAPD") has made at least 18 arrests and
9 recovered eight firearms at or connected to the Property. LAPD has also received community
10 complaints over the years about the constant loitering of gang members and associates at and
11 around the Property, some of whom have been armed, and the fear and intimidation the
12 gang's presence causes to the surrounding community.

13 5. The property owners – defendants Kenneth J. D'Oyen and Marjorie E. D'Oyen,
14 as trustees of the D'Oyen Family Trust Dated October 9, 2002 (collectively "Defendants") –
15 have known and are currently aware of the gang-related public nuisance activity occurring at
16 the Property but have thus far been unable or unwilling to abate the nuisance. Accordingly,
17 this Action is necessary to make the Property safe for its law-abiding residents and the people
18 in the surrounding area.

19 II. THE PARTIES AND THE PROPERTY

20 A. The Plaintiff

21 6. Plaintiff, the People, is the sovereign power of the State of California designated
22 in California Code of Civil Procedure section 731 to be the complaining party in actions brought
23 to abate, enjoin, and penalize narcotics nuisances and public nuisances, respectively.
24 Furthermore, the City of Los Angeles has a population in excess of 750,000, and as such,
25 California Business and Professions Code section 17204 authorizes Plaintiff, the People, to
26 prosecute actions for relief under California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et*
27 *seq.* for unlawful competition.

28 //

1 **B. The Defendants**

2 7. Defendants have been the record owners of the Property since at least
3 November 4, 2002 and prior to that, owned the Property in their individual capacities since at
4 least December 31, 1996.

5 8. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50,
6 inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious
7 names. When the true names and capacities of said defendants have been ascertained,
8 Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this complaint and to insert in lieu of such fictitious
9 names the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named defendants.

10 **C. The Property**

11 9. The Property is specifically described as "Lots 618 and 619, Hyde Park Track, in
12 the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per Map recorded in
13 Book 14 Page 21 of miscellaneous records, in the office of the County Recorder of said
14 County. Except therefrom all oil, gas, mineral and other hydrocarbon substances located not
15 less than 500 feet below the surface of said land, as provided in deed recorded June 29, 1969
16 as Instrument No. 2266," with Assessor's Parcel Number 4006-026-019.

17 **III. THE PUBLIC NUISANCE LAW**

18 10. "Abatement of nuisances is a long established and well recognized exercise of
19 the state's police power." (*People ex rel. Hicks v. Sarong Gals* (1974) 42 Cal.App.3d 556, 563;
20 *People ex rel. Bradford v. Barbieri* (1917) 33 Cal.App. 770, 775-778.) Civil Code section 3479
21 defines a nuisance as "[a]nything which is injurious to health, including, but not limited to, the
22 illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction
23 to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property .
24 . . ." (*Bakersfield v. Miller* (1966) 64 Cal.2d 93, 99 ["The Legislature has defined in general
25 terms the word 'nuisance' in Civil Code section 3479"].)

26 11. Civil Code section 3480 defines a public nuisance as "one which affects at the
27 same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons,
28 although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal."

12. In particular, drug dealing, loitering, consumption of alcohol and illegal drugs, and boisterous conduct which creates a hooligan-like “atmosphere” constitutes a public nuisance. (*People ex rel. Gallo v. Acuna* (1997) 14 Cal.4th 1090, 1120.)

13. Under Civil Code section 3491, “The remedies against a public nuisance are: 1. Indictment or information; 2. A civil action; or, 3. Abatement.” “An abatement of a nuisance is accomplished by a court of equity by means of an injunction proper and suitable to the facts of each case.” (*Sullivan v. Royer* (1887) 72 Cal. 248, 249.)

14. Code of Civil Procedure section 731 authorizes a city attorney to bring an action to enjoin or abate a public nuisance. It provides, in pertinent part, “A civil action may be brought in the name of the people of the State of California to abate a public nuisance . . . by the city attorney of any town or city in which the nuisance exists.” (*Ibid.*)

IV. UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

15. The practices forbidden by California's Unfair Competition Law at Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* include any practices forbidden by law, be they criminal, federal, state, municipal, statutory, regulatory or court-made. As the California Supreme Court has explained, the UCL “borrows violations of other laws and treats them as unlawful practices independently actionable under section 17200 *et seq.*” (*South Bay Chevrolet v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 861, 880 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted).)

16. As proscribed by the UCL, “[a]n ‘unlawful business activity’ includes anything that can properly be called a business practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law.” (*People v. McKale* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 626, 632.) Moreover, the UCL casts a broad net. “Any person performing or proposing to perform an act of unfair competition may be enjoined” (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17203.) The term “person” includes “natural persons, corporations, firms, partnerships, joint stock companies, associations and other organizations of persons.” (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17201.) The courts have expanded section 17200’s net beyond direct liability to include common law doctrines of secondary liability where the liability of each defendant is predicated on his or her personal participation in the unlawful practices. (*People*

1 *v. Toomey* (1985) 157 Cal.App.3d 1, 14; *Emery v. Visa Int'l Service Ass'n* (2002) 95
2 Cal.App.4th 952, 960.)

3 17. Civil actions under the UCL may be brought in the name of the People of the
4 State of California by any city attorney of a city having a population in excess of 750,000 (Bus.
5 & Prof. Code, § 17204), such as the City of Los Angeles. A public entity can sue pursuant to
6 section 17200 based on violations of its own municipal code, state law, or other local
7 ordinance. (*People v. Thomas Shelton Powers, M.D., Inc.* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 330, 338-
8 339.)

9 18. Defendants engaging in violations of the UCL may be enjoined in any court of
10 competent jurisdiction. (Bus. & Profs. Code, § 17203.) A court may make such orders or
11 judgments, including appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or
12 employment by any person of any practice constituting unfair competition. (*Id.*)

13 19. Although no case has specifically been called upon to define the term "business"
14 in section 17200, courts have frequently given a broad reading to the provisions of the UCL so
15 as to effect its broad remedial purposes. (See, e.g., *Barquis v. Merchants Collection Ass'n*
16 (1972) 7 Cal.3d 94, 111-113.) An enterprise engaged entirely in criminal conduct such as the
17 manufacture of illegal drugs or obscene matter is a business for purposes of section 17200.
18 (*People v. EWAP, Inc.* (1980) 106 Cal.App.3d 315, 320-321.) Moreover, recent amendments
19 to section 17200 make clear that even a one-time act of misconduct can constitute a violation
20 of the UCL. (*Klein v. Earth Elements, Inc.* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 965, 969.)

21 20. Further, the ownership and operation of a rental apartment complex is,
22 axiomatically, a business. (See *People ex rel. City of Santa Monica v. Gabriel* (2010), 186
23 Cal.App.4th 882, 888 ("The renting of residential housing is a business."); see also *Barquis v.*
24 *Merchants Collection Ass'n*, (1972) 7 Cal.3d 94, 111-113 (giving a broad meaning of the UCL
25 so as to effect its broad remedial purposes).) Thus, when a property owner conducts,
26 maintains or permits a nuisance that is unlawful under the PNL to exist on the premises of
27 such a business, it is a violation of the UCL. (See *San Francisco v. Sainez* (2000) 77
28 Cal.App.4th 1302, 1323.)

1 **V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE**

2 **[Civil Code Section 3479, et seq. --**

3 **Against All Defendants and DOES 1 through 50]**

4 21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Complaint and
5 makes them part of this First Cause of Action as though fully set forth herein.

6 22. Since at least 2011 through the present time, the Property has been owned,
7 operated, occupied, used, and/or directly or indirectly permitted to be occupied and used, in
8 such a manner as to constitute a public nuisance in violation of Civil Code sections 3479 and
9 3480. The public nuisance, as described herein, is injurious to health, indecent or offensive to
10 the senses, and/or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to substantially and
11 unreasonably interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property by those persons
12 living in the surrounding community. The public nuisance at and around the Property consists
13 of, but is not limited to: shootings; batteries; unlawful firearm possession; and the threatening
14 and disorderly presence of large groups of gang members.

15 23. Defendants, who own and/or control the Property, and DOES 1 through 50, knew
16 or should have known about the nuisance activity at the Property and failed to take reasonable
17 steps to prevent or abate the ongoing nuisance, and as a result of this failure and their
18 mismanagement of the Property, they have caused and/or contributed to a serious threat to
19 the general health, safety, and welfare of the law-abiding tenants at the Property and persons
20 in the surrounding community.

21 24. Unless Defendants, and DOES 1 through 50, are restrained and enjoined by
22 order of this Court, they will continue to use, occupy and maintain, and to aid, abet or permit,
23 directly or indirectly, the use, occupation, and maintenance of the Property, together with the
24 fixtures and appurtenances located therein, for the purpose complained of herein, to the great
25 and irreparable damage of Plaintiff and in violation of California law.

1 **VI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR UNFAIR COMPETITION**

2 **[Business and Professions Code Section 17200, et seq. --**

3 **Against All Defendants and DOES 1 through 50]**

4 25. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 24 of this
5 Complaint and makes them part of this Second Cause of Action, as if fully set forth herein.

6 26. Ownership and rental of residential housing, such as the Property, is a business.
7 When the owner of such a business violates the PNL such that a nuisance exists and
8 flourishes at the business' premises, as set forth herein, it is also a violation of the UCL.

9 27. Defendants and DOES 1-50 have violated the UCL by engaging in the following
10 unlawful or unfair business acts and practices: conducting, maintaining and/or permitting,
11 directly or indirectly, gang-related criminal and/or nuisance activity at the Property, as alleged
12 herein, in violation of the PNL.

13 28. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law, and unless Defendants and DOES 1-50
14 are restrained by this Court they will continue to commit unlawful business practices or acts,
15 thereby causing irreparable injury and harm to the public's welfare.

16 **PRAYER**

17 **WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF PRAYS THAT THIS COURT ORDER, ADJUDGE AND**
18 **DECREE AS FOLLOWS:**

19 **AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 1. That the Property, together with the fixtures and moveable property therein and
21 thereon, be declared a public nuisance and be permanently abated as such in accordance with
22 California Civil Code section 3491.

23 2. That each defendant and their agents, officers, employees and anyone acting on
24 their behalf, and their heirs and assignees, be preliminarily and perpetually enjoined from
25 operating, conducting, using, occupying, or in any way permitting the use of the Property as a
26 public nuisance. Such orders should include, but not be limited to physical and managerial
27 improvements to the Property, such as without limitation, a qualified professional property
28 management company ("PMC") to manage the Property, a full-time resident manager hired by

1 the PMC, armed security presence for as long as the PMC requests, key fob access for
2 pedestrians, gates that automatically close and lock, an internet-connected video monitoring
3 system accessible by LAPD, and such other orders as are appropriate to remedy the nuisance
4 on the Property and enhance the abatement process.

5 3. Such costs as may occur in abating said nuisance at the Property and such other
6 costs as the Court shall deem just and proper.

7 4. That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court deems just and
8 proper, including closure of the Property.

9 AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

10 1. That each defendant be declared in violation of Business and Professions Code
11 section 17200.

12 2. That each defendant, as well as their agents, heirs, successors, and anyone
13 acting on its behalf, be permanently enjoined from maintaining, operating, or permitting any
14 unlawful or unfair business acts or practices in violation of Business and Professions Code
15 section 17200.

16 3. That the Court grant a preliminary and/or permanent injunction prohibiting each
17 defendant, as well as their agents, heirs, successors, and anyone acting on their behalves,
18 from engaging in the unlawful or unfair acts and/or practices described herein at the Property
19 and in the City of Los Angeles. Such orders should include physical and managerial
20 improvements to the Property.

21 4. That, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17206, each defendant
22 be assessed a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each and every act of unfair competition. Since each
23 defendant has engaged in a continuing nuisance, each day constitutes an act of unfair
24 competition and each defendant should be assessed a civil penalty not to exceed \$3.65
25 million.

26 5. That, pursuant to the Court's equitable power and Business and Professions
27 Code section 17203, the Court make such orders or judgments, including appointment of a
28 receiver, to eliminate the unlawful or unfair competition alleged herein.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

2. That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Liora Forman-Echols
 LIORA FORMAN-ECHOLS
 Attorneys for Plaintiff, THE PEOPLE OF THE
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA